
From: Tarr, Jeremy M [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=98859532088E4437968231EB6FEF6B70-JMTARR1]
Sent: 7/18/2017 11:36:56 AM
To: Eudy, Ken [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=559b029a243848e7afd724eed4610137-keudy1]
CC: Adcock, Brad [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=7a1b918b7030401fb7421b370b57ae01-badcock]; White, Julia W [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=d92f33e7d43e44a9b15d6ec92e2348cb-jwbuckner]; Owen, Jenni [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=2282b573e68d40b38bf110b1530db523-jowen2]; Englert, Jessica M [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=a33c0786f7264aa7b1b51432ef5a2415-jmenglert]
Subject: RE: Subject: HB589 (Energy Bill) & NCSEA's Offer to Assist
Attachments: ltr 7-12-17 to Gov Cooper on 589.pdf

Passing along takeaways from recent conversations on H589:

Options for supporting wind under a moratorium

Here are some ideas from conversations about how Gov could mitigate the impacts of a wind moratorium, if he decides to sign.

- Meeting between wind companies and Gov Office, DEQ, DOT, DOC, and Veterans Affairs to identify helpful actions for wind
- Direct talks between Gov Office and wind companies
- Strong pro-win statement from Gov if he signs
- Direct DEQ to process wind permits as quickly as possible and have approvable permits ready for issuance day after moratorium
- Identify and alleviate any challenges wind companies have with transporting large blades from port to site
- Have representatives from Vet Affairs and DEQ at any NCGA meetings about the report to counteract any misinformation and highlight areas of agreement
- Advance legislation in August that would grandfather existing wind facilities, potential support from Sen. Steinberg and Sen. Smith-Ingram
- Look at designating wind economic zones, which would be areas preapproved for wind projects (idea needs vetting), in order to provide more certainty around wind permitting

Small hydro

On Monday, I met with Andy Givens and owners of a Jordan Lake hydro project. There are 25-30 small hydro projects around the state, which range from about 0.5-5MW in size.

They ask for a veto out of concern that 589 will reduce their capacity payments and put them out of business. They explained that the bill changes the avoided cost calculation in a way that may significantly reduce their capacity payments and decrease project revenue 20-40%. I can explain in more detail if you'd like.

Another issue for them (though they didn't raise it) is that because the standard contract under PURPA will apply only to projects 1MW and below and later to those 100kW and below, larger hydro projects won't qualify for the standard contract. H589 moves NC from a PURPA-driven to RFP-driven market. So just like other clean energy projects, small hydro can bid into the RFP process.

Audubon

Greg Andeck and Audubon disfavor the wind moratorium but would favor bill going into law. Suggest not signing in light of bill now being framed as a wind moratorium bill, rather than a clean energy bill.

NC WARN

NC WARN urges veto in the attached letter out of concern that the bill will hurt wind and rooftop solar. They have concerns about the bill being developed in closed-door process and it prolonging Duke Energy's monopoly.

Jeremy Tarr
Policy Advisor
Office of Governor Roy Cooper
20301 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-0301
919-814-2043 | Jeremy.Tarr@NC.Gov

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

From: Eudy, Ken
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2017 8:55 PM
To: Tarr, Jeremy M <jeremy.tarr@nc.gov>
Cc: Adcock, Brad <brad.adcock@nc.gov>; White, Julia W <Julia.white@nc.gov>; Owen, Jenni <Jenni.Owen@nc.gov>; Englert, Jessica M <jessica.englert@nc.gov>
Subject: Re: Subject: HB589 (Energy Bill) & NCSEA's Offer to Assist

Good to know about NCSEA. We may call of Ivan after we've heard from other stakeholders.

Please keep sending anything that might be remotely relevant to the issue.

Thanks, Jeremy.

On Jul 14, 2017, at 7:11 PM, Tarr, Jeremy M <jeremy.tarr@nc.gov> wrote:

Ken and Brad,

Ivan at NC SEA reached out on Monday with the email below making himself available to us if we have any questions regarding the energy bill. On a 15-minute follow-up call yesterday, he did not ask for a meeting with the Governor but reiterated NC SEA is available generally as a resource. We covered some of his substantive thinking on the bill. I made no promises or indication on any policy direction.

Jenni suggested I make you available of our exchanges this week and get your thoughts on how I can be most helpful with NC SEA and other energy stakeholders. As I continue to get calls about the bill and Governor meetings, is there a message I should convey to stakeholders? Should I forward all requests to you? As I gain input on stakeholders' substantive positions and their thoughts on long-term clean energy strategy, should I relay that to you in some way?

Thank you,

Jeremy

Jeremy Tarr
Policy Advisor
Office of Governor Roy Cooper

20301 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-0301
919-814-2043 | Jeremy.Tarr@NC.Gov

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

From: Urlaub, Ivan [<mailto:ivan@energync.org>]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 4:01 PM
To: Owen, Jenni <Jenni.Owen@nc.gov>; Tarr, Jeremy M <jeremy.tarr@nc.gov>; Peter Ledford <peter@energync.org>
Subject: Subject: HB589 (Energy Bill) & NCSEA's Offer to Assist

Hi Jenni and Jeremy,

I hope you're doing well and had a wonderful 4th of July holiday! I wanted to reach out to you both directly to offer NCSEA's assistance and advice as you, your staff, and the Governor are closely reviewing the final HB589 conference report ("Competitive Energy Solutions for NC" Act, which includes the 18-month wind moratorium) and evaluating next steps. I'm also aware that Julie Robinson, one of NCSEA's contract lobbyists, has had several recent conversations with Jeremy regarding HB589.

As you're aware, NCSEA's staff and lobbying team were extensively involved during the nine-month Energy Stakeholders process and negotiations, which led to the introduction of the original version of HB589 in the House, as well as the final negotiations with the House and Senate conferees and legislative leadership. All of this legislative work was based on direct recommendations and on-going feedback from renewable energy businesses, consumers, and other entities and individuals within NCSEA's diverse membership and network of partners. Based on our unique industry and legislative involvement on HB589, please know that my staff and I are available to answer any technical policy-related questions you may have regarding the different provisions included in HB589, as well as the short-term and long-term political dynamics associated with clean energy issues at the NC General Assembly, and if HB589 becomes law, the implementation process of the various solar programs at the NC Utilities Commission, which NCSEA plans to be highly involved.

Please feel free to email or call myself or Peter Ledford (NCSEA's General Counsel) if you'd like to discuss HB589 further by phone or in person.

Thank you,

-Ivan

Ivan Urlaub

Executive Director

4800 Six Forks Rd | Suite 300 | Raleigh, NC 27609

Office: (919) 832 - 7601, ext. 102

Cell: (919) 923-4332

www.energync.org

<image001.png>

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.